DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 522 CS 507 842

AUTHOR Bideshi, Davison; Wiseman, Richard L.
TITLE The Partners Program: The Effects of a Cultural Sensitivity Experience on Attitudes toward Others.
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Boise, ID, February 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Pluralism; Foreign Students; Higher Education; *Intercultural Communication; *Intercultural Programs; Multicultural Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Communication Behavior

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the relationship between a cultural sensitivity experience (the Partners Program, in which American students and foreign students meet on a weekly basis through a 15-week semester) and participants' attitudes toward members of other cultures. The 383 subjects (students from a western university) were assigned to one of three conditions: (1) those participating in the program in group settings; (2) those participating in the program in dyadic settings; and (3) those in a control group. Two variables were operationalized through a factor analysis of attitudinal items focusing on members of other cultures: cultural pluralism, and responsibility toward people from other cultures. Data analysis revealed that participation in the cultural sensitivity experience produced significant changes for both dependent variables. Also, the impact of the two experiential settings (group versus dyadic) was not significantly different, although there was a tendency for group interaction to increase overall satisfaction and willingness to continue participation in the program. (Two tables of data are included and 18 references are attached.) (Author/SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard L. Wiseman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED346522

CS507842

THE PARTNERS PROGRAM: THE EFFECTS OF A CULTURAL SENSITIVITY EXPERIENCE ON ATTITUDES TOWARD OTHERS

by

Davison Bideshi
Speech Communication Department
California State University
Fullerton, CA 92634

Richard L. Wiseman
Speech Communication Department
California State University
(714) 773-2918

Paper presented on the "Top 3" paper panel of the Intercultural Communication Interest Group of the Western Speech Communication Association, Boise, Idaho, February 1992.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE PARTNERS PROGRAM: THE EFFECTS OF A CULTURAL SENSITIVITY EXPERIENCE ON ATTITUDES TOWARD OTHERS

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship a cultural sensitity experience (the Partners Program) and participants' attidues towsard members of other cultures. The 383 subjects were assigned to one of three conditions: (1) those participating in the program in group settings (N=21), (2) those participating in the program in dyadic settings (N=56), and (3) those in a control group (N=306). Two variables were operationalized through a factor analysis of attitudinal items focusing on members of other cultures: (a) cultural pluralism and (b) responsibility toward people from other cultures. Data analysis revealed that after participating in the cultural sensitivity experience, there were significant changes for both dependent variables. Also, the impact of the two experiential settings (group vs. dyadic) was not significantly different, although there was a tendency for group interaction to increase overall satisfaction and willingness to continue participation in the program.

THE PARTNERS PROGRAM: THE EFFECTS OF A CULTURAL SENSITIVITY EXPERIENCE ON ATTITUDES TOWARD OTHERS

A number of studies have examined the dynamics of cultural integration. This body of research has been collectively know as "contact studies" and illustrates the effects when two ethnic groups are in close contact with each other for extended periods of time. From these extensive studies, the "contact hypothesis" emerged. According to Gudykunst and Nishida (1981), "historically, the major assumption of the studies that have been conducted on intergroup contact is that contact tends to produce better intergroup attitudes and social relations" (p. 110).

There has been several reviews of the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954; Amir, 1969; Gudykunst, 1977b). Amir (1969) traces the history of the contact studies in ethnic relation as far back to 1948. Basically, what the contact hypothesis maintains is that when people from differing backgrounds, ethnic groups, or countries interact, two contrasting effects are possible. First, the nature of the contact can create a new respect and liking of the other group and increase the chances for better interpersonal relations. Contact can reduce the negative stereotypes that the groups/individuals hold about each other. In sum, intergroup contact promotes "liking" and tolerance that can be extended to the next encounter when the individuals/groups interact with each other.

The second effect that has been observed is the opposite. Individuals may reinforce their negative stereotypes or develop newer

negative attitudes about specific groups. Succeeding contact may only exacerbate the tensions developed from previous encounters. Depending on the type of contact situation these observation can be drawn. Support for the kind of contact has been articulated by Sherif and Sherif (1953, p. 221) who stated that "in any discussion on the effects of contact on intergroup attitudes, we must specify: what kind of contact? contact in what capacity?"

Amir (1969) has maintained that there are other types of factors involved than just mere contact. Conditions that create favorable results from intercultural contact: (a) when there is equal status contact between the members of the various ethnic groups, (b) when the authority and/or the social climate are in favor of and promote the intergroup contact, (c) when the contact is of an intimate rather than casual nature, (d) when the ethnic group contact is rewarding, and (e) when the members of both groups in the particular contact situation interact in functionally important activities or develop common goals or super-ordinate goals that are higher ranking in importance than the individual goals of each of the groups.

Added to these suggestions is the variable of previous contact. Amir and Garti (1977) found changes in attitudes were related to previous intergroup contact. They suggest that only people who did not have previous contact showed attitude change as a result of the contact and that those who had previous contact could have altered their initial attitudes (one way or another) and were no longer susceptible to change.

Intracultural vs. Intercultural Contact

Gudykunst and Nishida (1981) maintain there are distinct

differences in intra- vs. intercultural contact affecting relational outcomes. Support for this difference was earlier found by Selltiz, Christ, Havel, and Cook (1963) who posit that in the intercultural situation, neither party may have any clear stereotypes of the other person in intercultural contacts, or, at worst, some members may have initial negative stereotypes about members of the other group. This may be true since the dominant and subordinate groups are in close proximity to each other (for example work environments, school, and social activities). Cultures that are physically distant, such as Japan, tend to be highly homogenized and have limited contact with foreigners. However, there are indications that contact between Japanese and members of differing cultures have increased negative stereotypes and foster discrimination.

Gudykunst and Nishida (1981) list four major differences between intracultural and intercultural contact. The first difference concerns the nature and extent of the pre-conceptions each group has about each other. A second difference between the two contact situations involves the abilities of the parties involved to communicate with each other. Another difference between interracial contact in the United States and intercultural contact involves the broader context within which intercultural contact takes place. Consequently, most of the studies that were carried out in the United States deals with a specific situation such as work, school, or housing. A fourth difference between the two types of contact involves the range of relevant attitude-objects. Most of the studies carried out in the United States involved the attitudes toward blacks whereas in the international scene, issues

ranging from foreign policy to intimate contact are pertinent. The final difference between interracial and intercultural contact is that interracial contact is characterized by strain and tension resulting from the dominant-submissive societal and interpersonal relationships historically imposed upon the non-white by the structure of America.

Effects of Intercultural Training

Wilson and Bonilla (1955) summarize research evaluating exchange programs in different countries involving students, specialists, and civic/opinion leaders. They conclude that programs that involve exchange of persons from culturally dissimilar backgrounds are worthwhile endeavors. For example, a program of exchange between the U.S. and a Latin American country resulted in a better understanding of cross-cultural prejudices. They reported that (a) most exchangees who had visited the U.S. testified they had left with a more favorable opinion than when they arrived, (b) this finding was confirmed by comparing their answers to certain questions about America with those from similar individuals who had not travelled in the U.S., and (c) their increased competence and prestige of travel to the U.S. seemed to augment their influence among their colleagues on professional questions as well as questions related to the U.S.

One final study was by Watson and Lippitt (1958), who surveyed Germans visiting the U.S. and found that exposure to a different pattern of values can bring about value change especially when the host culture offers new resolutions of value conflicts that are not adequately addressed in the home culture. A second finding was that explicit endorsement of democracy was highest at the time of departure and

dropped after return; also, internalized commitment to democratic values increased both in this country and again after return. This finding tends to support evidence that in an environment conducive to a particular idea, the concept will grow as opposed to a negative atmosphere where there is no support, the process will be hampered.

Although past research indicate that contact and training do indeed foster culture learning, educational institutions have been slow in implementing appropriate programs. Berech and Jain (1984) point to the need for educational facilities to begin implementing programs increasing students' world-mindedness and understanding of foreign cultures:

> Education (in the U.S.) has been a primary means of stimulating the acceptance of new attitudes and change. Unfortunately, most educational institutions have not significantly altered the content and orientation of their programs to correspond with the dramatic societal changes that have taken place during the past forty years. (p. 19)

If developments in international education are not taken, students will be ill-prepared for the world they face. This would be a tragedy. Steps to ameliorate this situation have been undertaken.

Hull (1972) reports on sensitivity training techniques as a means of increasing cultural understanding. His primary concern deals with the effects of cross-cultural sensitivity training on U.S. students. The scale used to measure the effect of the sensitivity training was the W-scale (national-minded to world-mindedness continuum). The use of unstructured interviews along with the data from the W-scale were utilized. Hull reported that the W-scale indicated a significant change in the students' attitudes for the experimental group toward

internationals in the direction of world-mindedness (as compared with the control group). Although no data were presented on the attitude change of the international students, excerpts from their reported comments indicated that they also had a change in the direction of world-mindedness towards the Americans. In concluding, Hull states:

> The experimental group of American students showed a significant increase in world-mindedness after participating in a sensitivity group also attended by students from other cultures; this change was retained five weeks later...Interview data supported the quantitative findings and provided strong indication that the experience was considered of value for both the Americans and international students involved. (p. 120)

Moran (1974), investigating whether participation in a weekend Intercultural Workshop (ICW) would produce any changes in world-mindedness and any relationship between personality and the pre-test scores of participants on the W-scale, reported mixed findings. Twenty-three foreign and United States students were divided up into three groups, served as the experimental group; 21 students participated in a delayed treatment ICW served as the control group. The W-scale was completed before and after the ICW for both groups.

Moran (1974) reported the following results: (a) There appeared to be some significant personality differences between a world-mindedness person and a national-mindedness person (Smith, 1955). (b) The foreign and United States students who participated in the weekend ICW did not significantly change in world-mindedness following the experience. (c) For the experimental group, there were no significant personality differences between participants who changed in world-mindedness following the ICW and those who did not. However, when

demographics were used, significant differences resulted. Females who changed toward greater world-mindedness tended to be score high on the sociability, self-acceptance, communality, and psychological-mindedness scale. Foreign students who changed toward greater world-mindedness tended to score high on the dominance, sociability, social presence, self-acceptance, and low femininity scales. Although statistical data did not reveal significance differences, overall interviews demonstrated the positive effect of the intercultural workshop. The reason may rest in the fact that the exposure was only for a weekend. It would seem that extended exposure would result in significant effects.

Gudykunst (1977a) also studied attitude change and behavioral changes following an Intercultural Workshop (ICW). In this study, five variables were taken into consideration: (a) participation in an ICW, (b) cross-cultural attitudes, (c) the number of cross-cultural friendships formed, (d) the potential for cross-cultural interaction, and (e) cross-cultural interaction. It was found that: (a) ICW participation significantly affects the number of cross-cultural friendships formed; (b) the number of cross-cultural friends and the cross-cultural attitude significantly affect the potential for cross-cultural interaction; (c) the cross-cultural interaction potential and the number of cross-cultural friends significantly affect the nature and type of cross-cultural interaction; and (d) there was no support for the hypothesized relationship between the participation in an ICW and changes in cross-cultural attitudes. Participation in ICW's does indeed change attitudes and behavior but participation itself is not the only determining factor. The combination of factors produce an indirect

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

influence on participation. Participation in the ICW appears to be conducive in the formation of cross-cultural friendships.

In a follow up study carried by Gudykunst (1979), three of the five variables were measured: (a) the effects of an ICW on cross-cultural attitude, (b) cross-cultural interaction, and (c) formation of cross-cultural friendships over time. Data for this study were collected at the beginning, immediately after, and six months following participation of an ICW. It was found that participation in an intercultural workshop only had an influence on the formation of cross-cultural friendships.

Another investigation into training programs produced similar results. Kiyuna (1977) investigated the effects of an ICW and intercultural sensitivity training on attitude change on two factors: (a) intercultural relationships and (b) nationality rankings as a result of participation. The results indicated U.S. students in the sensitivity groups reported more favorable attitudes toward Asians than the U.S. students in the intercultural workshops. Additionally, there were no changes as a result of participating in either of the groups for the Asian students. Kiyuna suggests that U.S. participants in the sensitivity groups had more favorable attitude change than students in the ICW because the focus of the former was based on interaction and the latter did not require as much personal involvement.

Another study geared toward understanding the relationship of participation in cross-cultural workshops and attitude change was examined by Stohl (1985). The participants were students who participated in the AMIGO (A Multicultural InterGroup Opportunity

program) (experimental group) and those enrolled in communication courses (control group). The purpose of the AMIGO project was to identify a problem that is common to a specific set of Amigos, design and implement a solution to the problem, and evaluate the success of the project. In addition, (a) each student [American] was required to meet individually with his or her Amigo [foreign] on a regular basis (once a week) and (b) each student is part of a small group which has the responsibility for deciding upon the criteria to be used to identify and choose the problem, designing a project that addresses the problem, implementing the solution, and evaluating it.

The results indicated that for attitude, responsibility, and importance of foreign exchange, only those students involved in the AMIGO project showed any significant change. There was also a significant time effect for peace, suggesting that across the semester both groups became more concerned with international peace. No significant change was found for openness toward new ideas. Stohl suggests that the items used to measure openness was weak and needs extensive revision because the qualitative data suggests that there was attitude change. The overall findings suggests that the program did indeed validate the objectives set up.

THE PARTNERS PROGRAM

The Parnters Program is designed to bring foreign-born and American-born students together in an effort for all to learn about other cultures. Meetings among the participants were scheduled on a weekly basis through the 15-week semester. Each meeting lasted around one hour. Unlike many of the studies mentioned above, the program was

based upon voluntary participation. According to the Parnters Handbook (1989, p. 1), important features of the program are: (a) the experience brings together individuals who represent a diverse background, (b) the program's goal is to reduce prejudices by learning from each other, and (c) fun will be emphasized as well as learning and understanding each other. To assess which format of this intercultural training program would be most effect, two forms of the program were tested: a dyad model where a native-born would be paired with a foreign-born (dyad model), and where a group of native-born and foreign-born participants (6-7 in number) would be created.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship of participation in the PARTNERS Program. In other words: Does participation in the PARTNERS Program increase an individual's cultural sensitivity towards other people and cultures? Secondly, does participation in group versus dyadic sensitivity training increase an individual's cultural sensitivity toward people and other cultures?

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The sample was 383 students from a western university. Of the students who participated, 51.7% were females and 47.9% were males. The average age of the students were 20.2 years old (s.d.= 3.5). From the sample, 69.4% were U.S. citizens, 20.7% were immigrants (those who held alien registration cards), and 9.9% were foreign students with F-1 visas. Of these respondents, 21 were in the group interaction condition, 56 were in the dyadic interaction codition, and the remaining 306 students represented the control group.

Procedure

For each of the three groups, initial data were collected during the fourth week of the fifteen-week semester, while the post-test data were collected during the 14th week. During this time, for those involved with the group condition, a trained facilitator led and participated in the group dynamics. The second experimental group, dyadic interaction, met on their own time. The control group was comprised of students enrolled in communications courses.

Questionnaire

The initial questionnaire consisted of twelve items extracted from the Stohl (1985) study. These items were chosen on the basis of two criteria: face validity (i.e., relevance to the program being investigated) and predictive validity (i.e., the ability to discriminate between the control and experimental groups in the Stohl study). Besides the items discussed above, the post-test questionnaire for the experimental groups also contained several open-ended items geared at soliciting responses about interaction in the various groups, namely, (a) overall satisfaction with the program and (b) continued participation in the organization.

Data Analysis

The primary purpose of this present study is to discover whether participation in the Partners Program does indeed increase cultural sensitivity. A factor analysis was used to determine the underlying dimensions of twelve items, viz., the dependent variables. The group differences on the underlying dimensions of the 12 items was accomplished utilizing the ANCOVA method of data analysis. The research

purpose can be divided into two empirical questions: (a) Does participation in the Partners program change attitudes toward other cultures? and (b) Is there a difference in the format of the Partners program (i.e., group versus dyadic) in the changes in participants' attitude toward other cultures?

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics for Attitudinal Items

The grand means and standard deviations for individual items are presented in Table 1. The three items rated most important were (in descending order of importance): (a) Item 8: people can learn many important things about our own country by communicating with foreigners who live here (Mean = 3.9), (b) Item 5: experiencing an extended contact with people in a foreign country makes a person better able to deal constructively with international problems (4.1), and (c) Item 11: spending time with people unlike ourselves is a worthwhile experience (4.2). The data suggest that students most agree that establish strong personal ties with people unlike themselves is a concept that should be practiced in order to learn more and deal constructively with their own culture as well as other cultures.

Factor Analysis for Cultural Pluralism and Responsibility

A Scree Test for the factor analysis of the 12 items suggested retaining a two-factor solution. The two factors were orthogonally rotated according to a Varimax criterion. As can be seen in Table 2, the factor loadings suggest a clear pattern.

Factor 1. The items having high loadings (i.e., over .40) on this factor were: (a) all sensible people believe in trying to be friendly

with other countries (loading = .42), (b) spending time with people unlike ourselves is a worthwhile experience (.58), (c) people can learn many important things about our own country by communicating with foreigners who live here (.62), and (d) experiencing an extended contact with people in a foreign country makes a person better able to deal constructively with international problems (.66). For the most part, these items represent the need for contact with foreigners in order to learn constructive ways of dealing with problems that arise due to pre-conceived notions. On the basis of these data, Factor 1 was labeled Cultural Pluralism.

Factor 2. The items having high loadings (i.e., over .40) on this factor were: (a) our country is probably no better than many others (loading = .46), (b) it is our responsibility to help foreigners adjust to and enjoy living in this country (.49), (c) the United States should send food and materials even to unfriendly nations if they need it (.50), (d) our responsibility to people of other cultures should be as great as our responsibility to people of our own culture (.50). For the most part, these items represent a need to help people from other cultures both on an international and personal level. On the basis of the data, Factor 2 was labeled Responsibility to Others.

Analyses of Covariance

An analysis of covariance revealed that after controlling for initial pre-dispositions, the dyadic Partners respondents showed greater gains in their attitudes toward cultural pluralism ($F = 7.2$, $df = 1/100$, $P < .009$, eta = .27) than the control group. The analysis also revealed that the dyadic-orientation experimental group showed greater gains in

their attitude to the responsibility factor ($F = 4.9$, $df = 1/100$, $P < .03$, eta = .44) than the control group. For both factors, data analyses confirmed that the dyadic-oriented Partners program facilitates cultural sensitivity.

An analysis of covariance revealed that after controlling for initial pre-dispositions, the group-oriented Partners experimental respondents showed greater gains in their attitude towards cultural pluralism ($F = 5.0$, $df = 1/163$, $P < .03$, eta = .23) than the control group. The analysis also revealed that the group-formatted experimental group showed greater gains in their attitude to the responsibility factor ($F = 11.9$, $df = 1/163$, $P < .001$, eta = .36). For both factors, data analysis confirmed that Partners does facilitate cultural sensitivity.

Further analysis revealed that there were no significant differences between the dyadic and group-oriented formats of the Partners program on either the cultural pluralism or responsibility factor. Although statistically significant differences were not achieved, those who participated in the Partners group-oriented format, rather the dyadic format, showed a greater tendency toward cultural pluralism and responsibility factors.

Analysis for satisfaction with the Partners Program revealed a more positive attitude for group participation ($F = 3.8$, $df = 1/68$, $P < .05$, eta = .23) than the dyadic format. For continued participation in the Program, results revealed a greater willingness for those who participated in the group format ($F = 5.6$, $df = 1/68$, $P < .02$, eta = .28) than in the dyadic format.

DISCUSSION

Overall results indicated that Partners is a viable program for cultural learning and responsibility. Through participation in this cultural sensitivity program, participants enhanced their understanding of how cultures are both similar and different. An awareness was gained in the responsibility toward culturally dissimilar individuals, i.e., there was a change from national-mindedness to world-mindedness.

The results supported both research questions. Participation in the Partners Program increased cultural pluralism and increased the perceived need for responsibility toward other peoples and cultures. The data for other factors such as satisfaction with and continued participation in the Partners Program illustrate the success of the program.

The data suggest that the differences between a dyadic program to a group-oriented format influence an individual's willingness to learn and care about other peoples and cultures. The significance is that group learning is better by allowing for a variety of expressed opinions rather than the limited information in dyadic experiences. The dyadic data might be interpreted to show that although one perspective does cause a change in attitude, multiple perspectives tend to facilitate a greater understanding of problems and issues. Increased chances of learning from different individuals causes an individual to move away from being self-centered and to a more worldmindedness.

Satisfaction and willingness to continue participation can be attributed both to the group dynamics and the ability of the facilitator to keep interest on a high level. Satisfaction and willingness to

continue participation, for those involved in the dyadic relationship, was low probably due to the element of only one perspective. For those in the group setting, satisfaction was due to the significant interaction of more than one worldview. Other explanations for the phenomena are (a) in the group-oriented formats, people may have the tendency to feel less anxious due to the mere presence of more than one individual, (b) the group dynamics were set up so that there was a support system intact and conversation was encouraged ("nobody's going to laugh at you" or "your opinions are important to us"), and (c) because of the structure participation was made easier and more flexible. In essence, there was more to learn and talk about, i.e., interest was built from many world views.

As suggested by Amir (1969) when there are supportive conditions, prejudice is reduced. In the group-format, equal participation has a better chance of succeeding since there are more opportunities to achieve support for one's viewpoints. Further, legitimization for one's view point is less likely to be capricious. Group goals and standards are set by the group--the matters are discussed and then action is taken. In other words, the dyadic relationship maybe based on personal rather than superordinate goals (i.e., group goals). This could be a possible explanation for the higher satisfaction rate among the group-oriented participants. In addition, the group-oriented participants were supported, even when the person's English language ability was lower than the rest. If something was not understood or if the facilitator interpreted it as being not understood, there would be a rephrasing and paraphrasing for the group's understanding. For the

dyadic relationship, if one person was not quite as articulate as the other, conversation, understanding, and patience may be low. The more fluent person would dominate in all the conversation and the less fluent person would be silent--less exchange would take place.

Since participation in the Partners Program was purely voluntary, meetings were voluntary. In addition, those who elected to join the program were probably disposed to learning about other cultures and people. For those in the one-on-one relationship, it was easier to keep away or not show up to a meeting because it was just one person being disappointed. For the group interaction, not showing up after a while left a gap in the group--this type of action affected not only one person but a group of individuals. In addition, friendships were developed in the groups that demanded a commitment to the whole group. For those involved in the one-on-one relationship, if disliking occurred, it was easier to break the commitment. As continued participation progressed, cultural pluralism and responsibility for other people and cultures grew.

The results of this study are consistant with research carried out by Stohl (1985), Amir and Garti (1977), Gudykunst (1977a), Moran (1974), and others who have studied the effects of intercultural contact and attitude change. Overall, the findings of this study and others have given strong, positive evidence that interacting with people unlike ourself is worthwhile and does, in fact, change attitudes given the conditions suggested by Amir (1969).

In sum, the purpose of the Partners Program seem to be validated as a means for individuals who have an interest in learning about

different cultures and ways of life. Advantages should be taken to expand this program at the university and outside communities. Knowledge about other worlds should not be kept tied down in one environment. With training and persistence, this organization has a major objective than can be achieved.

In considering future research, short-term as well as longitudinal studies should be encouraged. A second variable that should be taken into account when researching ICW's and sensitivity training groups is the ability of the participants to process and comprehend information. In my experience as a group facilitator (about four and one-half years), the ability of foreign nationals to process and understand the English language has been on a continuum from minimal to excellent. Even when language proficiency is high, the ability to understand nuances is low. This should be taken into consideration when researching attitude change and intercultural contact. Finally, attempts should be made to incorporate a more comprehensive training program when dealing with sensitivity training--interpretation of gestures, nonverbal communication, and actual teaching of what to say (i.e., how to communicate). This last point, "what to say," has been neglected by researchers and other training personnel. Too many times information is provided but any indication on what to say in situations have been neglected. So, in consideration of future research, this variable must be studied and some sort of typology or schematic be generated as a guideline. Without further studies, mistakes that were made in the past will be continually made and relationships will be broken or never get started.

We must begin to broaden our horizons because human beings, by nature, think that their own distinct culture is the best. They should be made aware that judgments should be withheld when differences are encounterd. The innate nature of ethnocentric behavior is a difficult and stubborn beast that needs to be tamed in order for any individual to become a cosmopolitan and effective intercultural communicator. The attitude that must be fostered is one of cultural relativism. It is here the individual begins to see that all cultures should be judged or viewed from internal values, mores, and idiosyncratic behaviors rather than be interpreted from his or her (the visitor's) own cultural standards. Being able to see a culture for what it is, is the initial starting point on the way to becoming an intercultural being.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). The nature of prejudice. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesely.

Amir, Y. (1969). Content hypothesis in ethnic relations. Psychological Bulletin, 71, 319-342.

Amir, Y., & Garti, C. (1977). Situational and personal influence on attitude change following ethnic contact. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1, 58-75.

Berech, C. L., & Jain, N. C. (1984). The role of an intercultural event in improving global awareness. Journal of the Arizona Communication and Theatre, 25, 19-23.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1977a). The effects of an intercultural communication workshop on cross-cultural attitudes and interaction. Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1977b). Intercultural contact and attitude change: A review of literature and suggestions for future research. In N. C. Jain (Ed.), International and Intercultural Communication Annual, v. IV (pp. 1-16). Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1979). The effects of an intercultural communication workshop on participants over time: An exploratory investigation. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, San Antonio, TX.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1981). The intercultural communication workshop: Foundations, developments, and affects. In W.B. Gudykunst & T. Nishida (Eds.), Readings in intercultural

communication (pp. 107-135). Tokyo: Geirin-Shobo Publishing Co.

Hull, F. W. (1972). Changes in world-mindedness after a cross-cultural sensitivity group experience. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 8, 115-121.

Kiyuna, K. M. (1977). Building closer relationships between Asians and American university students: Two group approaches. Communication, 6, 51-55.

Moran, R. T. (1974). Personality correlates and changes in worldmindedness after an intercultural group experience. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Partners Handbook (1989). Published by the Office of International Education and Exchange, California State University, Fullerton.

Selltiz, C., Christ, J., Havel, J., & Cook, S. (1963). Attitudes and social relations of foreign students in the United States. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1953). Groups in harmony and tension: An integration of studies in intergroup relations. New York: Harper.

Smith, H. P. (1955). Do intercultural experiences affect attitude? Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 51, 469-477.

Stohl, C. (1985). The A.M.I.G.O. project: A multicultural intergroup opportunity. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 9, 151-175.

Watson, J., & Lippit, R. (1958). Cross-cultural experience as a source of attitude change. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2, 61-66.

Wilson, E. C., & Bonilla, F. (1955). Evaluating exchange of persons programmes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 19, 20-30.

TABLE 1
GRAND MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FOR INDIVIDUAL ITEMS

	Mean	s.d.
I can accept the leadership of other countries in many important fields.	3.3	1.0
The United States makes it easy for foreigners to adjust to living in this country.	3.3	1.0
In my opinion, all sensible people believe in trying to be friendly with other countries.	3.7	1.0
It is our responsibility to help foreigners adjust to and enjoy living in this country.	3.4	1.1
Experiencing an extended contact with people in a foreign country makes a person better able to deal constructively with international problems.	4.1	.9
I believe that the United States should send food and materials even to unfriendly nations if they need it.	3.1	1.1
Our responsibility to people of other cultures should be as great as our responsibility to people of our own culture.	3.4	1.1
People can learn many important things about our own country by communicating with foreigners who live here.	3.9	.9
There are many problems for foreign students/faculty/families attending the university.	3.2	1.0
Our country is probably no better than many others.	2.5	1.2
Spending time with people unlike ourselves is a worthwhile experience.	4.2	.9
The United States should try to be on friendly terms with other countries who are unfriendly to us.	3.4	1.0

TABLE 2
FACTOR LOADINGS FOR INDIVIDUAL ITEMS

	F1	F2
I can accept the leadership of other countries in many important fields.	.37	.31
The United States makes it easy for foreigners to adjust to living in this country.	.08	.31
In my opinion, all sensible people believe in trying to be friendly with other countries.	.42	.08
It is our responsibility to help foreigners adjust to and enjoy living in this country.	.35	.49
Experiencing an extended contact with people in a foreign country makes a person better able to deal constructively with international problems.	.66	.07
I believe that the United States should send food and materials even to unfriendly nations if they need it.	.28	.50
Our responsibility to people of other cultures should be as great as our responsibility to people of our own culture.	.31	.50
People can learn many important things about our own country by communicating with foreigners who live here.	.62	.16
There are many problems for foreign students/faculty/families attending the university.	.27	.31
Our country is probably no better than many others.	.12	.46
Spending time with people unlike ourselves is a worthwhile experience.	.58	.17
The United States should try to be on friendly terms with other countries who are unfriendly to us.	.32	.29